



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

TRANSACTIONS  
OF THE  
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

1896.

---

I. — *Superstitions and Popular Beliefs in Greek Tragedy.*

BY DR. ERNST RIESS.

THE following paper is the first attempt to collect the "Thesaurus Superstitionum," prefatory to a history of Greek and Roman superstition. If the aim had been to amass materials, I could easily have found a more fertile field. As it is, however, the yield has been beyond my expectations. Yet I know well I shall not escape the criticism of those to whom I may seem to have omitted important passages, or to have included quotations of no apparent bearing upon the subject. To them my answer is that it has been impossible to give the reasons for omission or reception of every item without unduly swelling a paper, which, from the conditions of its publication, must naturally be kept within certain limits. If I live to complete my task, all these reasons will be stated in full elsewhere.

The form of an alphabetical catalogue has seemed to be most adequate for immediate use, and to facilitate references to it in later work. The notes preceding the catalogue are intended to discuss such points as seemed to demand a more elaborate treatment, either on account of their intrinsic value, or to justify the reception of doubtful statements. But during the work I have more than once been tempted to lay down my pen, overcome by the proportions of the task.

Therefore, as in my last paper, I urgently repeat the call for fellow-workers in cataloguing the whole body of ancient literature.

*Aeschyl. Choeph.* 466-496.

These verses have as yet not met with the attention they undoubtedly deserve.<sup>1</sup> Part of the fault the poet himself seems to bear. For when the chorus addresses Orestes and Electra with the words καὶ μὲν ἀμεμφῇ τόνδ' ἐτείνατον λόγον (497), he plainly marks the preceding verses as an amplification of the kommos which had been sung before. In this the grief of the orphans has been set forth, and it ends with a prayer to Agamemnon (ἄκουσον ἐς φάος μολών, ξὺν δὲ γενοῦ πρὸς ἐχθρούς 446 f.), imploring him to come to his children's aid. This prayer is followed by an invocation of the blessed dead in general to grant their support (ἀλλὰ κλύοντες, μάκαρες χθόνιοι, τῆσδε κατευχῆς πέμπετ' ἀρωγὴν παισὶν προφρόνως ἐπὶ νίκη 463 ff.). This impression that the following στιχομυθία is only an amplification has prevailed to such an extent, that the poet has even been accused of making the action of his tragedy drag. A closer interpretation, however, will show that far from doing this he has preserved in these thirty verses an admirable bit of genuine folk-lore.

Both sister and brother begin by stating their wants, — Orestes praying that the lost throne may be restored to him, Electra that she may escape some danger threatening her from Aegisthus. For so much the corrupt passage seems to reveal. Then they tell of the good which will fall to Agamemnon's lot, if he will assist them, and at the same time the dishonorable starvation to which his refusal will expose him.<sup>2</sup> Both, now, turn for a moment to the deities of the lower world, and invoke Earth and Persephone to send their father up to the living. Then, reverting to Agamemnon, they remind him of the shameful way in which he was

<sup>1</sup> Erwin Rohde alone seems to interpret these lines in the right way. He calls them a "Wecklied": *Psyche*, 523, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Rohde, *ibid*.

put to death, and ask: Art thou awakened by these *ὄνειδη*, oh father? Finally they once more briefly state their grievances and tell the soul that its own interest requires it to help them. As we easily see, the arrangement is fourfold: first, the wish for help; secondly, the promised honors; thirdly, the prayer addressed to the chthonic deities; fourthly, the wrongs suffered by Agamemnon.

The *Choephoroe* was represented in 458 B.C. I turn now to the magical papyri which are, approximately, six hundred years or more later in date. Here we shall find all four of the previously named parts used in spells, although, as far as I remember, the four nowhere occur together. This is best seen, perhaps, from the *διαβολή εἰς Σελήνην*, large Papyrus of Paris, 2573 ff. and elsewhere, and separately printed by Wessely in front of his edition.<sup>1</sup> The hymn first enumerates the various compounds of the sacrifice which the sorcerer is about to offer to the goddess in order that she may willingly do his bidding. This fills the first 13 verses. But with verse 14 quite another chord is sounded:

Ἥ δειν' ἔλεξε τοῦτό σε δεδρακέναι τὸ πρᾶγμα.  
κτανεῖν γὰρ ἄνθρωπὸν σ' ἔφη, πιεῖν τό θ' αἷμα τούτου<sup>2</sup>  
σάρκας φαγεῖν μήτρην τε σὴν εἶναι τὰ ἔντερ' αὐτοῦ.  
καὶ δέρμ' ἐλεῖν δόρκης ἅπαν κείς τὴν φύσιν σου ἐστί.<sup>3</sup>  
αἶμ' ἱέρακος πελαγοδόμου τροφή τε κάνθαρός σοι.<sup>4</sup>

These are clearly *ὄνειδη*; and, as in the Aeschylean prayer, *ὄνειδη* committed by those against whom the aid of the addressed person is invoked. Thirdly, there comes in the papyrus the prayer proper. Thus, of the Aeschylean disposition we have here parts 2, 4, 1, in this order. And we remember that in Aeschylus, too, the prayer proper is once more repeated at the end. Part 3 alone, the invocation of the gods, is missing, and justly so, because this sorcerer has

<sup>1</sup> C. Wessely, *Wiener Denkschriften*, XXXVI. p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> *πιεῖν τὸ αἷμ' ἀνθρώπου*, Wessely. I restored the reading of the MS.

<sup>3</sup> *θεῖναι* W. with 2659. *ἐστί* 2597. The accusative with *ἐστί* need not offend in a poem that measures *σφαγιάζει* ∪ — ∪.

<sup>4</sup> *καὶ κάνθαρον τροφήν σοι* W. from 2660. But 2598 *τροφήντε κάνθαρός σοι* MS.

no higher goddess than his Selene-Hekate, living upon the flesh of the dead. This part, on the other hand, occurs e.g. in the *ἀγωγή ἐπὶ ἡρώων*, Pap. Par. 1390 ff. where Ereschigal and Persephone are asked to send up the souls of the *βιαιοθάνατοι*.

Now, my thesis is this: the Aeschylean verses are a true charm-song, and probably fashioned after some spell, current in actual necromancy. But might the resemblance not be merely accidental? One might certainly say that it is incomplete. First, not all of the four parts occur together in the papyri, and secondly, while the *ἀγωγή* is really a spell conjuring up the dead, the scope of the *διαβολή* seems widely different. Now, in fact, the latter song may well be considered as belonging to chthonic rites. For, not to speak of the character of the sacrifice offered,<sup>1</sup> the goddess herself is called *ὄγκον βυθοῦ πνέουσα* (2601), *Μήνη*, *Ἑρμῆς καὶ Ἑκάτη* (2609), *Βασίλεια βριμώ* (2611), *Εἰνοδία* (2615). And of the spell it is said: *ὄνειροπομπεί, κατακλίνει, ἀναιρεῖ ἐχθρούς* (2624-5). But we may establish our view more firmly by comparing related scenes.

There is, first, in the very same *Choephorae* the prayer Electra addresses to her father's soul 116 ff. At the beginning she invokes Hermes to carry her prayer *πρὸς τοὺς γῆς ἔνερθε δαίμονας καὶ Γαῖαν αὐτήν* (3). Then she pours out her libation (2) and states her needs and wants (1 and 4 combined). And again, as in the joint prayer, she finishes by once more stating her wish. That this cannot be regarded as a mere coincidence is shown by the careful wording of the whole passage which, especially in verses 139 and 140, closely follows popular models. *Ταῦτ'*, Electra says, *ἐν μέσφ' τίθημι τῆς κακῆς ἀρᾶς*, but as the curse may reflect back on him who curses, she averts this consequence by adding: *κεῖνους λέγουσα τήνδε τὴν κακὴν ἀράν*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Its components are: *αἰγὸς ποικίλης στέαρ, ἔχωρ παρθένου νεκρᾶς, καρδία ἄωρον, οὐσία νεκροῦ κυνός, ξμβρνον γυναικός* and so on. Of course, these frightful names are smoke and dust, and stand, as so often in these rites, for the names of harmless plants. But these herbs are still substitutes for the real thing.

<sup>2</sup> For similar cases on *devotiones*, see W. J. Battle, PROCEEDINGS AM. PHIL. ASS. XXVI. p. lvii.

Of course we have to compare the conjuring up of Darius in the *Persae*, 625 ff. Here the arrangement is as follows: 626-630 the *χθόνιοι δαίμονες* are invoked to send the ghost (3). 631-637: Darius is asked to come and help the Persians (1). 638-655: invocation of the *χθόνιοι* to send him (3). 655-659: Darius is again called, and the present calamity is vividly depicted. Parts 2 and 4, as we see, are missing. But we may perhaps excuse this omission by the outlandish character of the whole scene, and by the fact that the soul of the dead king, according to the poet's representation, was always honored, while Agamemnon's had been neglected. Of *ονειδής*, of course, there could be none, as Darius had died peaceably, unless we consider the defeat of his son Xerxes an *ὄνειδος*.

Looking round among the other poets, nothing is more natural than to compare the two tragedies in which Sophokles and Euripides have treated the same subject. Sophokles, unfortunately, does not offer any material for comparison.<sup>1</sup> But Euripides has an elaborate prayer, *Electra* 671-682. Its arrangement is as follows: 671. 675: Orestes asks Zeus to give him victory, and Electra concurs in this wish (676). Then he turns to Hera, the mistress of Mycene's altars (674), to have pity upon them (672), and again Electra echoes this in 673. Now Orestes invokes his father (677), — while Electra calls upon earth (678), beating it with her palm, as is usual in chthonic rites, — to help his children (679) — with all the dead, Electra adds (680), — his faithful warriors, who fell before Troy (681, Or.), and who hate the evil doers (683, El.). And with 682 Orestes brings the prayer to an end by reminding his father of his *δεινά: ἤκουσας, ὦ δειν' ἐξ ἐμῆς μητρὸς παθών*.<sup>2</sup> Here, again, we have some of the parts of the

<sup>1</sup> It seems almost as if Sophokles has protested against these scenes of witchcraft. Thus he addresses the maiden: *ἀλλ' οὔτοι τίν γ' ἐξ Ἀΐδα παγκοίνου λίμνας πατέρ' ἀνσάσεις οὔτε γόοισιν οὔτ' ἀνταίς*: *El.* 137-139.

<sup>2</sup> It will be seen that the order of verses followed here (671. 675. 676. 674. 672. 673. 677-681. 683. 682) is somewhat different from Kirchhoff's. I think mine to be the better one. The stichomythic correspondence (Or. a. El. b.) is indeed no longer maintained. But we have still a good correspondence: a, a, b. a, a; b. a, b. a, b. a, b. a. It must be noted that 671 certainly begins a new paragraph, marked by the silence of the *πρόσβυς*, let alone the distinct division

Aeschylean division, viz. 3. 1. 4. Only part 2, the promise of sacrifices, is omitted.

Similarly runs the thought in the touching passage of the same poet's *Orestes*: 1225-1239, where Orestes, Electra, and Pylades in their imminent peril call upon Agamemnon to help them. 1225-1234 invoke his aid and tell the dead man that his offspring is threatened by his own brother, and recount the merits of his son and daughter in avenging his violent death. Then they offer him a sacrifice (1239), their tears, indeed, for nothing else has been left to them. The similarity of the arrangement as a whole is unmistakable. But most noteworthy of all is verse 1238 when Pylades breaks in: οὔκουν οὐνεῖδη τάδε κλύων ῥύσει τέκνα; Here we have again those οὐνεῖδη on which Aeschylus laid so much stress. However, none have really been mentioned in the preceding verses. The οὐνεῖδος here seems to be strictly hypothetical as attaching itself to Agamemnon, if he, indeed, desert his children and come not to their help. And so it almost becomes a threat. And this squares admirably with the tenor of the passage in the *Choephoroe*, where Agamemnon is incited to help by the warning that otherwise he will have to go hungry among the other feasting souls.

There is one more passage, bearing upon our subject: *Helena*, 962 ff. Here Menelaos and his wife are sitting at the tomb of Proteus, and the king implores Theonoe to save him from his brother. And now he turns to the dead man and prays for his protection (962), here also adding as a threat that disgrace will follow him for all time, if he does not soften his daughter's heart (967-8). Thereupon he pleads with Hades to come to his support by influencing Proteus. For, —and we shall see that this is of far-reaching importance, —on account of Helen so many dead have

in sense. On the other hand, the grouping of the verses gains in clearness, for now Zeus alone is, and properly, invoked to give victory, while of Hera only her pity is asked. As to calling Orestes and Electra ἐκγονοί of Hera, one must think of the close relations between Mycene and Hera. For the Argive Heraion originally belonged to Mycene: Paus. II. 17. Pauly-Wissowa<sup>2</sup>, II. 788, 59. Cp. also the numerous statuette of Hera found in Mycenean tombs: Schuchhardt, *Schliemanns Ausgrabungen*, 332.





mouth, I let fall the earth. I make South North," and so forth.<sup>1</sup> And similar threats in necromancy are also found in the Izdubar-Nimrud epos of ancient Babylonia.<sup>2</sup>

This discussion, I think, must have made clear that the verses *Choeeph.* 466-496 are not a mere reiteration of the preceding song, but are in fact, as Rohde calls them, a "Wecklied," based upon and in all their essential features taken from actually existing popular beliefs. We cannot, however, rest satisfied with this mere statement of fact.

The question now presents itself: In what direction shall we look for the original, that is to say, are the poetical passages just examined imitations of magical rites actually performed, or are these analogies taken from magic, the outgrowth of a later development? To put it more tersely, we are confronted by the old problem, as to whether prayer and charm-song are not originally identical, and is not the prayer, taken in our modern sense, only a purified spell? The number of Folk-loristic observations, at the outset, seems to favor such a view. Whithersoever we look among primitive tribes, we find charms and spells so interwoven with the sacrificial ritual that it seems impossible to disentangle the two. Nor is this aspect changed if we look at the depth instead of the width of the evidence. Even the contrite prayers on Assyrian tablets, which so aptly have been called "Busspsalmen," are said to be nothing but prayers by which a stronger god is asked to expel this or that demon who has caused sickness. And as to India, an authority like Hopkins treats under the head of magical practices<sup>3</sup> a prayer addressed to some goddess to make a woman fruitful and gives the following hymn, calculated to procure blessings, as an example of magic in the Atharva Veda:<sup>4</sup> "Blessings blow to us the wind, Blessings glow to us the sun, Blessings be to us the day, Blest to us the night appear, Blest to us the dawn shall shine." Nobody will think for a moment of contesting the antiquity of magical rites. But it seems very hard to relegate a piece of such a beauty as our Aeschylean passage to the low realm

<sup>1</sup> Erman, *Aegypten*, 473.

<sup>2</sup> Ettig, *Acheruntica*, 257.

<sup>3</sup> E. W. Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, 149, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 154.

of witchcraft. More readily I should like to find both of common origin. In a paper published some years ago<sup>1</sup> I defined the difference between superstition and magic as follows: The magician aims at the deification of his personality, while superstitious man is always conscious that he is subject to the supernatural. The same distinction, it seems to me, must be made between prayer and spell. In prayer we ask the god for something, leaving it in his power to grant or to refuse, while the spell tries to coerce the god. But neither does this exclude a common origin nor does it stamp the spell as a degraded prayer. On the contrary, it is my opinion that to primitive man nothing that is done in regard to the supernatural is without its distinct and immediate effect. I regard the prayer in exactly the same light as the sacrifice. That the word itself is everywhere fully equivalent to a real action in primitive religious thinking, about that, I think, no doubt is permitted. It is a long time since the force of analogy in superstition and charm has been recognized; analogy, that is, of word and deed. If you say: flesh to flesh and bone to bone, in pronouncing a charm over a broken limb, you do not mean actually to command the broken parts to go together. Thus it can appear only to modern feeling. To the unbiassed primitive mind it is rather thus, that simultaneously and by analogy to my word, and by my word, the severed parts unite again. Nor is this restricted to the sphere of superstition. Says Dr. Ruben<sup>2</sup> of the passage 2 Kings xiii. 14-19: "The reality of the future stands under the influence of its dramati- cal prototype and pattern: supposing only, that this *δράμα*, this *μύμησις*, is performed by divine power." Therefore, we may advantageously shift our question from prayer to sacrifice and afterwards, as the same laws evidently govern both, draw our conclusions.

This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the various opinions put forth about the nature of sacrifice. A brief statement must be sufficient. The sacrifice has been ex-

<sup>1</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopædie*, I. 32, 39 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Paul Ruben, *Critical Remarks upon Some Passages of the O.T.* p. 1. Compare also his note on מַנְיָ in the sense of "creating," p. 3\*.

plained (1) as a sign of devotion and reverence, (2) as tribute, (3) as a sign of a covenant, (4) as a means of unification with the deity. But with all due deference to the authors of these explanations I must say that, taken singly, none of them seems to meet satisfactorily all the aspects of the sacrifice. Nor is this to be expected. I am convinced, although not yet fully prepared to prove, that it is a mistake, only too frequently made in mythological research, to assume simplicity of thinking, where, on the contrary, the highest complexity should be expected. It is not in the character of primitive man to think, as it were, in a straight line and to work out *one* thought. Such clearness of reasoning as is required for this process is a product only of long and severe training during many generations. As I understand it, many threads come together and are tightly interwoven to make up the texture of primitive thought. Not to one cause alone, but to a multiplicity of causes, presenting themselves all at the same time, does primitive man ascribe the effects that fall under his notice. It is in this sense that I desire the following discussion to be received, not as one that offers *the* principle of sacrifice in intercourse with the divine power, but as discussing *one* principle among many. And now to proceed *in medias res*.

The most striking feature of all sacrifices, to my mind, is the necessity of tasting in some way of the meat offered. This, in fact, is found everywhere, with two exceptions, viz. the sacrifices to the dead and their gods, and the so-called piacular or conciliatory sacrifices. Of course, this has not escaped the attention of others. The most generally accepted view nowadays seems to be the one first hinted at by Liebrecht<sup>1</sup> and afterwards elaborately worked out by William Robertson Smith<sup>2</sup> and, in his footsteps, by Frazer.<sup>3</sup> Their idea, in short, is that by eating of the sacrificial meat the worshipper eats of the god himself, and by doing this acquires

<sup>1</sup> Felix Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, 436 ff.

<sup>2</sup> W. R. Smith in *Encyclop. Brit.* "Sacrifice," and in his *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, 2d ed.

<sup>3</sup> Frazer, *The Golden Bough*.

a part of the divine nature.<sup>1</sup> But I think that another explanation is at least plausible and answers better. To state my thesis at the outset : by the sacrifice the worshipper wants to enter into a blood-covenant with the god exactly as he can enter into a blood-covenant with his fellow-men. For the history and the frequency of blood-covenanting it suffices to refer to Trumbull's book.<sup>2</sup> Trumbull, indeed, states that such blood-covenanting with a god was clearly practised in Egypt,<sup>3</sup> but as I do not know enough of Egyptian ritual, I shall not enter on this topic. But he gives enough of other examples to show of such actual occurrences. Thus in India, "the devotee, in the Devil-Dance, cuts and lacerates himself till the blood flows, . . . drinks the blood which flows from his own wounds, or drains the blood of the sacrifice ; putting the throat of a decapitated goat to his mouth."<sup>4</sup> Here the explanation of the god thought incarnate in the sacrifice seems still plausible, and is, indeed, adopted by Trumbull himself. On the other hand, it is not at all necessary to mingle the two kinds of blood. Thus in Borneo "it would seem from the description of Mr. Hatton that, in some instances, the blood-covenanting is by the substitute blood of a fowl held by the two parties to the covenant, while its head is cut off by a third party ; without any drinking of each other's blood by those who enter into the covenant."<sup>5</sup> A still more striking instance is reported of the Sioux. Where one Dakota takes the other as his "koda," *i.e.* god or friend, they become "brothers."<sup>6</sup>

If thus we have proved the possibility that sacrifice may be a vicarious means of blood-covenanting, let us see how far this view meets the various aspects of the sacrifice. The privileges and obligations of the blood-covenant may be summed up as follows. Both covenanters become of the same kin : this would cover Smith-Frazer's idea of sacrifice. They share all their belongings, from meals and tents on-

<sup>1</sup> Smith follows this view more outspokenly in his Lectures than in the *Encyclopædia*.

<sup>2</sup> H. Clay Trumbull, *The Blood-Covenant*.

<sup>3</sup> p. 79.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 92.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 52.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 55, 4.

wards to the most cherished possessions. How far this may pertain even to human sacrifices has been well stated by Trumbull himself.<sup>1</sup> But the most striking instance of it, to my knowledge, is found in a late magical papyrus.<sup>2</sup> Here we read : παρατίθει αὐτῷ (τῷ θεῷ, scil.) ἐξ ὧν μεταλαμβάνεις βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν. And the effect of such commensality is declared to be : τελευτήσαντός σου τὸ σῶμα περιστελεῖ ὡς πρέπον θεῷ· σοῦ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα βαστάξας εἰς ἀέρα ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ· εἰς γὰρ "Αἰδην οὐ χωρήσει ἀέριον πνεῦμα συσταθὲν κραταιῷ παρέδρῳ. The pledge of blood-covenanting, furthermore, involves mutual protection : this, too, is one of the features of the cult : the god is not only asked, but required to help his worshippers, as *they* are bound not to let him starve. And the neglect of these duties involves the deepest disgrace. Here, I think, we have the origin of the queer custom, still existing among the lower classes of Roman Catholic faith, e.g. in Italy, where I myself witnessed such an occurrence, the custom of chiding and abusing the god who refuses his help. For when mere asking does not suffice to rouse the activity, then *ὀνειδίη* may awake the ire of the contracting party and recall his sense of honor.

And now to return to the analogue of sacrifice, to the prayer. It is clear that all these principles apply equally well to this. But, moreover, the idea of covenanting seems, to me at least, fully to explain what has been styled the business-like, bargain-striking feature, especially of Roman worship, but no less of Greek prayer. When Chryses, driven out from the Greek camp and running along the shore, prays to Apollon, "if ever I have roofed over for thee a pleasing temple or if ever I have offered thee sacrifices, come thou now to my help and avenge me," he decidedly reminds the god of the duties which he has taken upon himself, as it were, by contract. And the god immediately obeys. Now, this idea of reciprocity was not restricted to Greeks and Romans alone. Nowhere, perhaps, is it more forcibly expressed than in the Old Testament, which repeatedly enjoins duties upon the

<sup>1</sup> Trumbull, see Index : sacrifices, human.

<sup>2</sup> Papyrus mag. Berol. ed. Parthey, *Abhandl. Berl. Akad.* 1865, 169-70, 177 ff.

Hebrews with the distinct understanding that under these conditions God, too, will fulfil his part of the contract and not withhold his blessings. It would be utterly wrong to ascribe this "business-idea" to the mercantile spirit of the peoples concerned, in face of its almost universal occurrence. On the other hand, if we derive it from a contract by covenant shaped after human models, it is easy to explain. But I think it superfluous to heap example upon example.

One more word in conclusion. It should now be clear that neither prayer nor charm-song, on the basis of our explanation, can claim priority over each other; but that both have been derived from the common source of the "covenant-reminder." In the charm-song its obligatory side is more sharply pronounced, although, especially in the contract form, traces are still to be found in prayer. This, however, emphasizes more the voluntary side, until, with a steady moral progress, it has become purified and cleansed of all the grosser features adhering to its ancestor. Thus far the charm-song claims rightly to be the more original, and bears out the definition of superstition as religion become *stark*. It is a survival of an earlier stage of intercourse with the divine power. But to repeat this finally once more, I am far from seeing in this discussion *the* explanation and panacea. Many are the threads of the texture, and — *dies diem docebit* — slowly we must continue to unravel them one after the other.

*Aeschyl. Choeph.* 959–962 :

τάχα δὲ παντελὴς χρόνος ἀμείψεται  
 πρόθυρα δωμάτων, ὅταν ἀφ' ἐστίας  
 μύσος πᾶν ἐλαθῇ  
 καθαρμοῖσιν ἅτᾶν ἐλατηρίοις.

960

E. Rohde<sup>1</sup> has admirably shown that purification is by no means a requirement of morals, but is simply meant to drive away evil spirits. The passage quoted above bears him out more clearly than any other I know, because of the words ὅταν ἀφ' ἐστίας πᾶν μύσος ἐλαθῇ καθαρμοῖσιν ἅτᾶν ἐλατηρίοις.

<sup>1</sup> *Psyche*, 364 ff.

This latter expression is well explained by the scholiast, who quotes the noun formed from it: ἐλατήριον· τὸ καθαρτικὸν φάρμακον. It is noteworthy that this μύσος, which has to be driven out, has its seat at the hearth. For here the spirits of the deceased ancestors dwell, and among them as μύσος the souls of the two βιαιοθάνατοι in the family of Atreus, Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra.

*Aeschyl. Suppl.* 202-3:

Δα. καὶ Ζηγὸς ὄρνιν τόνδε νῦν κικλήσκειτε.

Χο. καλοῦμεν αὐγὰς ἡλίου σωτηρίους.

Have we here obscure traces of a belief which considered the sun to be a bird? If ὄρνις were used here in its figurative meaning, as seer, prophet, we should simply think of the frequent identification of Helios and Apollo. But this is impossible, since in the very next two verses Apollo himself is expressly addressed. The scholiast must have had in mind an explanation similar to mine. He writes as follows: τὸν ἥλιον· ἐξανίστησι γὰρ ἡμᾶς ὡς ὁ ἀλεκτρυών. However, he seems to be mistaken as to the character of the bird. For surely, everybody, in hearing of the bird of Zeus, would first of all think of the god's faithful companion, the eagle. Such a view, I think, cannot have been strange to the Greek mind. Surely we are past the time when it was a sacrilege to speak of animal worship among the Greeks. The numerous animals, under the disguise of which demons were wont to appear,<sup>1</sup> the general worship bestowed upon the snake,<sup>2</sup> ought to convince even those whom neither Cook<sup>3</sup> nor Milchhoefer<sup>4</sup> has as yet taught the truth. Nor will the student of Folk-Lore look askance at this explanation. For to him many examples of similar "incarnations" are known.<sup>5</sup> But an

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Bienkowski, *Eranos Vindobonensis*, 295.

<sup>2</sup> See Furtwängler, *La Collection Sabouroff*, introduction; E. Rohde, *Psyche*, index.

<sup>3</sup> *Journ. Hell. Stud.* 1894, 81 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Anfaenge der Kunst.* 54 ff.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. Andrew Lang, *Custom and Myth*, 84 ff.; bird and sun connected also in the Slavic Baruch-book: Gött. Gel. Anz. 1896, 98.

authority on Greek mythology will, I hope, more fully set this forth at a not too distant day. I must add, however, that by accepting my view, a superstition may be satisfactorily explained which I, at least, have always felt it difficult to understand. I refer to the miraculous legend that the *ἄλκαιοτος* compels his breed to look into the sun, and kills those whose eyes shed tears, a tale which is told as early as Aristotle,<sup>1</sup> and which, of course, has not escaped a moral interpretation.

I have never been able to believe in the common and rationalistic explanation of the matter; viz. that the legend is founded on the sharp sight of the eagle, from which the proverbial "eagle eye" is derived. On the other hand, once we admit that eagle and sun were related, because the sun himself was an eagle, all seems to be plain to me. Thus the family of Aietes inherited from their ancestor, the Sun-god, the sunny eye.<sup>2</sup> At this point it also becomes clear why the eagle, the bird related to the sun, holds so prominent a place among the oracle birds. For the sun sees everything.<sup>3</sup> Nor, do I think, is it very difficult to see why the sun was believed to be an eagle. But *βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσση μέγας βέβηκε*, and I must be satisfied at present to refer the reader to Usener's paper on Pasparios.<sup>4</sup>

*Sophokl. Aias*, 661–663.

Aias has started out to bury the sword with which he killed the cattle of the Greeks. For this sword is a gift from Hector, he says, and ever since I got it, I have been pursued by misfortune.

ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἀληθὴς ἡ βροτῶν παροιμία  
ἐχθρῶν ἄδωρα δῶρα κοῦκ ὀνήσιμα.

Wolff in his notes refers us for this passage to the Greek custom of removing instruments of murder from the society

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. an.* IX. 34. Cp. Pauly-Wissowa, I. 371, 53–65.

<sup>2</sup> Apollon. Rhod. *Argon.* IV. 124.

<sup>3</sup> 'Ἡέλιος, ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷς Γ, 277. Cp. the German 'die Sonne bringt es an den Tag.'

<sup>4</sup> *Rhein. Mus.* XLIX, 461 ff.



of men. But the reason which the poet himself gives hardly agrees with this ; and still less the proverb which Aias quotes, and to which the editors refer the saying of Laocoon in the *Aeneid*.<sup>1</sup> The true reason, of course, is exactly that given by Sophokles himself. Whatever we get from an enemy is "no good." For an evil charm lies upon such gifts and they bring to their owner nothing but ill-luck. In one word, they are fascinated.<sup>2</sup> Thus the presence of witches and of the arch-fiend himself, in modern superstition, either brings about misfortune or, at least, turns to naught.<sup>3</sup> On this idea we must base our understanding of Aias' action. He does not simply throw away his sword, — for it might return to him, — but he buries it in the soil, as things infected with an evil charm are buried, e.g. in sympathetic cures.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, earth has the power to bind the evil force and to make it inefficient, as in many rites of ancient superstition.<sup>5</sup> And our passage may perhaps help us to understand why this is so. For in vs. 660 Aias says: ἀλλ' αὐτὸ νῦξ Ἰδης τε σφάζοντων κάτω. That is to say, by burying the sword it is handed over to the chthonic deities, to keep it from light. The same idea underlies the custom of burying the magical papyri with their owners. For there is something uncanny about the implements of witchcraft that makes them liable to wreak a curse on their innocent possessors. Therefore it is good to get rid of them. And where are they more securely kept from returning than in Hades? That Aias is not simply doing away with his sword, when he buries it, is shown, if need be, by vs. 657 ff. :

μολών τε χῶρον ἐνθ' ἂν ἀστιβῆ κίχῳ  
κρύψω τόδ' ἔγχος, ἔχθιστον βελῶν,  
γαίας ὀρύξας ἐνθα μήτις ὀψεται,

precautions which too closely resemble the measures taken in superstitious actions to be ascribed to a mere coincidence.

<sup>1</sup> II. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. 817 ff.: δῶρον μὲν ἀνδρὸς Ἑκτορος ξένων ἐμοὶ μάλιστα μισηθέντος, ἐχθίστου δ' ὀρέων.

<sup>3</sup> Wuttke, *Deutscher Volksaberglaube*,<sup>2</sup> § 395.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. §§ 492–495. Cp. Geopon. X. 67, 3.

<sup>5</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclop.* I. 44, 32 ff.

*Sophokl. fg.* 181 N<sup>2</sup>.

In his 'Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις Sophokles, according to Strabo, told that it was Calchas' fate to die as soon as he should meet with a stronger or better soothsayer. Simple as this little tale seems, it has a most interesting bearing upon some mythological questions. Why must Calchas die, if he is defeated by a member of the guild? We might first think of tales like that of the Sphinx who kills herself after Oedipus has solved her riddle. But this legend itself is too closely connected with numerous fairy tales from everywhere, in which the power of a demon is broken as soon as some puzzle he proposes is solved, or as soon as somebody comes who sees through his disguise.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand we have a curious and instructive passage in Pseudo-Jamblichus' book *περὶ μυστηρίων*<sup>2</sup> on the power of the so-called ἀντίθεος. That is to say, if a magician had secured some "spiritus familiaris" who ministered to his wants and then met another magician who had compelled some δαίμων of higher rank to be his servant, the might of the former one was broken, overcome by the stronger spirit. It seems to me that the Sophoklean legend runs in this line of thought. Nor can I believe it to be a mere αὐτοσχεδίασμα of the poet himself. The facts referred to thus far show that such beliefs must have been common currency. In whatever light we look upon Calchas, whether as an enthusiastic prophet after the fashion of the poet's time, or as possessor of the ἔντεχνος μαντική,<sup>3</sup> in either case he was believed to act under the influence of a god from whom he derived his power. Meeting another soothsayer therefore means that he has met a stronger god. And before this one his own "spiritus" gives way, and the prophet himself must die. Now this, I think, should warn us not to put too implicit a faith in Frazer's<sup>4</sup> explanation of the duel between the priest at Nemi and his would-be successor.

<sup>1</sup> See Laistner, *Das Rätsel der Sphinx*.

<sup>2</sup> Ps.-Jambl. π. μυστ. II. 10, 53; III. 31. See Lobeck, *Aglaſphamus*, 58.

<sup>3</sup> For this difference see Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination*, and Daremberg-Saglio s. *Divination*; cp. also Rohde's *Psyche*, 344 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, 213 ff.

According to Frazer the god, embodied in his priest, cannot be allowed to become old and impotent, and therefore his representative is killed, that he make room for a new and vigorous incarnation. But it seems to me unnecessary to assume that one and the same god is thought to exist in an always resplendent state of youth, so that only his visible avatar continue to be strong. To the Greeks at least another line of thought was equally familiar. To them a god might die, yet be reborn.<sup>1</sup> A last faint remnant of this belief may even be found in the unplastic language of Greek astronomers when they speak of the new moon as *γέννα σελήνης*. The moon dies with the last quarter, but newly born, she comes forth again in all her strength in the new phase. Now as here a new personality continually takes the place of the old, distinct from its predecessor, yet emphatically of the same nature, thus, as I conceive it, is the process also in the cases stated by Frazer. And we have the same thought, only differently developed in the Calchas' legend and the group of cognate tales alluded to above. Only here the god is also different in person. I am far from denying that in many cases Frazer's explanation is right. But, as I did in the discussion of sacrifice, I must make this point: that it is futile to reduce all and every similar ritual or mythological occurrence to the same formula. Complexity, not simplicity, must be our watchword.

*Sophokl. fg. 910 N<sup>2</sup>:*

καὶ ἀμφώβολα, φασί, παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ αἱ διὰ σπλάγχνων μαντεῖαι.

Eustath. 1405, 30. Nauck compares Hesych. I. p. 166, ἀμφώβολα · ἡ διὰ τῶν σπλάγχνων μαντεία, but he adds: grammatici isti quae tradunt, mihi videntur incredibilia. Now, I cannot see why these notices should be incredible. Surely there is nothing strange in Sophokles mentioning a prophecy from the entrails, which was largely practised in Greece no less than in Etruria. Here the monuments come to our aid.

<sup>1</sup> See also Usener *Goeltternamen*, 228 ff.

There exists a large number of vases representing sacrificial scenes, on which we see men or women holding spits over a fire. The points of these spits always are completely covered with what must be meat.<sup>1</sup> Now that this was not meat for the meal, but used for some ritual purpose, is proved by the nature of the fire, which in all cases is burning on the altar. The only remaining difficulty would be the designation of meat as *σπλάγχνα*. But this is guarded by Virgil, who surely, if ever a poet, took pains to use the technical expressions of the cult. Servius remarks to *Aen.* VI. 253: viscera; non exta dicit, sed carnes. Nam viscera sunt quicquid inter ossa et cutem est. Thus, no doubt, the Eustathius and Hesychius passages acquire their justification, and since Professor H. W. Smyth kindly informs me that there are no linguistic objections to the form *ἀμφώβολα*, it will henceforth be safe from any attack.

*Eurip. Alc.* 428-9:

τέθριππά θ' οἱ ζεύγνυσθε καὶ μονάμπυκας  
πώλους, σιδήρω τέμνεται ἀχένων φόβην.

These lines, beautiful in their expression of overpowering grief, may to most readers seem no more than a poetical exaggeration. They have preserved to us, however, a trace of a primitive custom, widely spread among Aryan peoples at least. When the owner of an estate in Germany dies, according to a popular superstition, his death must be announced to all the animals thereon, nay, even to the fruit-trees in the orchard.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the quotations and for drawings of the more important vessels I am much indebted to my friend Dr. Robert Zahn in Heidelberg. Most monuments belonging here are enumerated by Stephani, *C. R.* p. 1868, p. 132. I give only the most important ones: 1, *C. R.* 1868, VI. 1; 2, *Arch. Zeitg.* 1845, 35, 2 = *Journ. Hell. Stud.* IX. 1 (Brit. Mus. E 494); 3, Gerhard, *A. V.* 155, 1; 4, *Ibid.* 155, 2 = Baumeister, *Denkmäler f.* 1303; 5, *Mon. Inst.* VI. 8; 6, *Mon. Inst.* IX. 53; 7, Heydemann, *Hall. Winckelmannsprog.* 1880; 8, *Él. céram.* II. 108; 9, Catal. Brit. Mus. III. pl. XVII (E 505).

<sup>2</sup> Wuttke, *Deutscher Volksaberglaube*,<sup>2</sup> § 727.

Meaningless as this custom now seems, we have in it a remnant of the old idea, that the domestic animals form an integral part of the family. The same idea shows itself in other superstitious rites.<sup>1</sup> And, therefore, in some parts of Bohemia, when the master dies, they hang crape over the beehives, exactly as they put red cloth over them when a wedding takes place.<sup>2</sup> And now, I think, it is clear that here we have more than merely an exaggeration by the poet. The Thracians are asked to shear their horses as a sign of mourning for their dead queen, exactly as they would do if a member of their own household died. I think it not impossible that Euripides refers here to some actually existing custom of the North, of which, by the frequent intercourse between this part of the Balkan peninsula and Attica, the poet might have had some knowledge even before his own visit to Macedonia.

*Eurip. Alc.* 756.

Why is the drinking-cup, out of which Hercules feasts in the house of Admetus, called *κισσιῶδες ποτήρ*? The scholiast is silent about it. But Cato<sup>3</sup> and Pliny<sup>4</sup> inform us that ivy wood was believed to be permeable by water, but not by wine, so that cups of this material were used to test whether wine was adulterated or not. I am inclined to see in this the reason why Euripides mentions the material of the cup. It is true the Greeks usually put water into their wine. But with the gluttonous character of the hero, as Admetus' slave describes him, the potation of unmixed wine, which was ordinarily a sign of immoderacy, seems to agree very well.

*Eurip. Hel.* 1065-6:

ἀλλ' οὐ νομίζειν φήσομεν καθ' Ἑλλάδα  
χέρσῳ καλύπτειν τοὺς θανόντας ἐναλίους.

<sup>1</sup> Thus a new cock is received into the family, by being led three times round the table: Aelian. N. A. II. 30; cp. about this and similar modern superstitions, Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclop.* I. 30, 35-66.

<sup>2</sup> Grohmann, *Aberglaube aus Böhmen*, § 606.

<sup>3</sup> Cato, *de agri cult.* 111.

<sup>4</sup> Pliny, *N. H.* XVI. 155.

This is the reason which Helen will give to the king of Egypt, if he should ask her why she cannot bury the dead Greeks on the mainland. And later on we hear from Menelaus that the bodies must be sent out so far ὥστ' ἐξορᾶσθαι ῥόθια χερσόθεν μόλις (1269). And when Theoklymenos asks for the reason of this, the hero answers: ὡς μὴ πάλιν γῆ λύματ' ἐκβάλλῃ κλυδών. Numerous funeral inscriptions in honor of shipwrecked persons show that really this was only a pretence. But was this always so? It is, at least, a curious coincidence, that even in our days the fisher population along the shores of the North Sea do not like to pick up the bodies of drowned men, because that forebodes ill-luck. Instances of this belief have been mentioned in English newspapers as late as 1894. The very use Euripides makes of this pretence seems to render it not unlikely that in some parts of Greece even in his time the same superstition may have prevailed.

*Eurip.* *fg.* 664 N<sup>2</sup>:

πρὸν δέ μιν λέληθεν οὐδὲν ἐκ χερὸς,  
ἀλλ' εὐθὺς αὐτᾶ· τῷ Κορινθίῳ ξένῳ.

“The Greeks, too, had the custom not to pick up whatever falls to the ground from the dinner-table, but to leave it to the souls roaming about in the house.” Thus Rohde, *Psyche*, 224, 1, with regard to Athen. X. 427 E, where our passage is quoted. But these verses show more than the mere existence of this fact. Not only were the souls believed to wait hungrily for the crumbs which fell from the tables of the living, but one may even assign this refuse to certain souls. We can hardly believe that souls of every description were thought to haunt any given house. Much more likely is it, in view of the correlation between dinner-table and hearth, that only the dead of the family were lingering round their former abode. Now, as the Κορίνθιος ξένος cannot be counted among these, the queen must have believed in the possibility of sending food to the beloved foreigner by some one of his comrades, whom she charges with this commission.

Apparently the souls were thought not only to feed themselves, but also to carry away some food for those of their mates who had stayed behind in Hades. And it is in this way that the queen sends her offerings to Bellerophon.

*Ion* fg. 54 N<sup>2</sup>:

ἐξήλθον ὑμῶν ἰκέτις ἡ βώντων τροφὸς  
παίδων, βόθρους λιποῦσα πενθητηρίους.

These lines are quoted by Plutarch, *consol. ad Apollon.* c. 2, p. 113 B, in support of an alleged (ἱστοροῦσιν) rite of mourning. "Some," he says, "hide themselves in pits and remain there several days, unwilling to see the light of the sun, since the dead, also, has been deprived of this boon." We may pass over Plutarch's explanation. But does this entitle us to think lightly of the rest of this account, as, to my knowledge, every one has done who has hitherto treated of burial rites? Notwithstanding this general and silent condemnation, I am inclined to find here a survival of a very old ceremony. It has been established beyond a doubt that among Aryan peoples originally the widow and the favorite slaves of the dead were killed at his tomb.<sup>1</sup> Traces of this are found in the human bones existing alongside of the dead bodies in Mycenaean tombs.<sup>2</sup> It is further well known that in a milder age substitutes for the cruel sacrifice were introduced, as hair offering and so forth.<sup>3</sup> Another substitute for this, I think, has been preserved in the rite mentioned by Plutarch. Here a temporal burial, first, perhaps, compulsory and afterwards voluntary, has replaced the lasting deposition. I hesitate, however, to put this view forth as more than a hypothesis, as long, at least, as no proof is forthcoming from other sources.

<sup>1</sup> Schrader, *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, 565.

<sup>2</sup> Rohde, *Psyche*, 16, 31 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Rohde, *ibid.* 16, 1. As to substitutes for the so-called 'suttee,' see Tylor, *Early Culture*, 1. 465 ff.

## INDEX.

## A.

- Ἀδράστεια**, (Eurip.) Rhes. 467-8; s. undecried.  
**ἄειζων**, magical herb, Aeschyl. fg. 28. 29 N<sup>2</sup>.  
**ἄγνος**, fg. ad. 396 N<sup>2</sup>; s. sympathy.  
 amulet (lions' claws): Aeschyl. Sisyp. fg. 225 N<sup>2</sup>; s. bells. (lions' heads) fg. ad. 230 N<sup>2</sup>. (snakes), Eurip. Ion, 24-6, 1427-31. (horses), (Eurip.) Rhes. 306; s. Gorgo.; (Eurip.) Rhes. 308; s. bells.  
**Ἀνταία** (spectre), Aeschyl. Semele, fg. 223 N<sup>2</sup>; Sophokl. fg. 69 N<sup>2</sup>, 311 N<sup>2</sup>, 368 N<sup>2</sup>; schol. Eurip. Or. 1454.  
**ἄντιθεος**, Sophokl. fg. 181 N<sup>2</sup>; s. p. 21.  
**ἁπαύωλημα** (spectre), Sophokl. fg. 915 N<sup>2</sup>.  
 apotropæum, Eurip. Phoen. 631 and schol.  
**ἁποτροπιασμός** (of dreams), Aeschyl. Persae, 201 ff.; Sophokl. El. 424-5; Eurip. Hecub. 68-82 (**ἀποπέμπομαι**); Iphig. Taur. 42-3.  
 Asia (seat of witches), Eurip. Androm. 159-60: s. women, witches.  
 astrology, Sophokl. fg. 671 N<sup>2</sup> (doubtful); Eurip. Melanippa f. 482 N<sup>2</sup>.  
 B.  
 Barbarians' speech like that of birds: Aeschyl. Agam. 1003-4; fg. 450 N<sup>2</sup>; Eurip. fg. 907 N<sup>2</sup>; Ion, fg. 33 N<sup>2</sup>; s. birds.  
**βάσκανος**, Sophokl. fg. 931 N<sup>2</sup>; fg. ad. 533 N<sup>2</sup>; s. evil eye.

- bat, uncanny? fg. 681 N<sup>2</sup>.  
 bells (as amulet), Aeschyl. Sept. 368-9; (Eurip.) Rhes. 308; s. amulet.  
**βαιοθάνατοι** (spectres), Aeschyl. Eumen. 98 (doubtful).  
 excite mania, Eurip. Herc. fur. 966-7.  
 birds, speech like barbarians'; s. barb.  
 mantic from; s. **οἰωνιστική**.  
 black, color of the Erinyes, Eurip. Or. 321.  
 blood, love charm, Sophokl. Trach. 575.  
 stains after murder? Aeschyl. Choeph. 1009-10.  
 wiped off on the corpse, Sophokl. El. 445-6; s. **μασχαλισμός**.  
 blowing, Aeschyl. Suppl. 43; 555 ff.; cp. 552.  
 burial, of drowned people forbidden, Eurip. Hel. 1065-6; s. p. 25.  
 of those killed by lightning, Eurip. Suppl. 934-38; Phaeton fg. 786 N<sup>2</sup>.  
 unburied corpses as spectres, Eurip. Hecub. 1-54.

## C.

- Castor as St. Elmo's fire, Eurip. Or. 1637.  
 charms, Eurip. Androm. 32-3; Med. 384-5, 787-9, 1168 ff.; fg. ad. 317 N<sup>2</sup>.  
 of Orpheus, Eurip. Alc. 966-9.  
 against fire, Eurip. Androm. 271-3.  
 against snake bites, Eurip. Androm. 269 ff.  
 against sterility, Eurip. Med. 717-8.



charms against love, Eurip. Hippol.  
387-9, 509-12, 516.

excite hatred between husband  
and wife, Eurip. Androm.  
157-8; cp. 205; s. love-charms.

charm-song, Aeschyl. Agam. 973-5;  
1372; Eum. 327; 338; 639;  
Prom. 174-6; Sophokl. O. C.  
1192-4; fg. 87 N<sup>2</sup>, 491 N<sup>2</sup>, 492  
N<sup>2</sup>; Eurip. Bacch. 234; Cycl.  
646-8; Hecub. 1272; Hippol.  
478-9; Phoen. 1036 and schol.  
Phoen. 1260.

healing, Sophokl. Ai. 581-2;  
Trach. 1001-3; fg. ad. 364 N<sup>2</sup>.

causes eclipse of the moon, Sosi-  
phanes, fg. 1 N<sup>2</sup>.

in necromancy, Sophokl. El.  
137-9.

copper, used in herb-gathering,  
Sophokl. 491 N<sup>2</sup>.

Corinthians, a people of wizards,  
schol. Eurip. Med. 11.

covering, of implements in gather-  
ing herbs, Sophokl. fg. 491 N<sup>2</sup>.

crib, snakes on it, as amulet, Eurip.  
Ion, 24-26.

crumbs under the dinner-table,  
Eurip. fg. 664 N<sup>2</sup>; s. p. 25.

curses, against the evil eye, Agathon,  
fg. 23 N<sup>2</sup>.

cyclamen, magical herb, Sophokl.  
N<sup>2</sup>, p. 248.

#### D.

*Δαιμονίζεσθαι*, Sophokl. fg. 173 N<sup>2</sup>;  
s. evil eye.

dead, as spectres, Eurip. Alc. 1127;  
Phoen. 1543-5.

harm men, fg. ad. 370 N<sup>2</sup>.

drink blood, Sophokl. O. C. 621-2;  
Eurip. Hecub. 535-8.

death, and prophecy, Aeschyl. Agam.  
1250-2.

makes unclean, Eurip. Alc. 22-3.

death, lord of souls, Eurip. Alc.  
843; 1140.

marks his victims, Eurip. Alc.  
74-6; Phryn. Alc. fg. 3 N<sup>2</sup>.

fetches his victims, Eurip. Alc.  
24 ff.

feeds on the tomb, Eurip. Alc.  
843-5.

demon = soul, Eurip. Alc. 1140.

sends mania, Sophokl. Ai. 278-9;  
fg. 227 N<sup>2</sup>; Achaïos, fg. 30 N<sup>2</sup>.

= animal, Aeschyl. Agam. 1631.

dogs as souls, Aeschyl. Choeph.  
917; 1051; Eurip. fg. 469 N<sup>2</sup>?

= *κῆρες*, Eurip. El. 1252-3;  
1342-3.

dreams, interpretation of, Aeschyl.  
Prom. 487-8.

interpreter, Aeschyl. Choeph.  
31-3.

prophetic, Sophokl. El. 498-500;  
fg. ad. 375 N<sup>2</sup>; s. *ἀποτροπαισ-*

*μός*.

drowned people, not buried, Eurip.  
Hel. 1065-6; s. p. 25; cp. burial.

#### E.

Eagle, and snake, Sophokl. Antig.  
113-126 and schol.; s. sym-  
pathy.

earth, binding force of, Aeschyl.  
Pers. 222-3; Sophokl. Ai. 657

ff.; s. fascination.

receives libations in purifying,  
Sophokl. O. C. 482.

*ἔχιδνα*, Aeschyl. Choeph. 991-2; s.  
*μύρρανα*.

eclipse, of moon, effected by magic,  
Sosiph. fg. 1, N<sup>2</sup>.

*Εἰνοδία*, Eurip. Ion, 1048-50.

St. Elmo's fire = Helen and the Di-  
oscuri, Eurip. Or. 1637; fg. ad.  
463 N<sup>2</sup>.

elves in the house, Eurip. Hel. 819-  
20.

ἐμπυρομαντεία, Aeschyl. Prom. 500-1; Sophokl. Antig. 1005-11; Eurip. Bacch. 255-7; Hel. 746; 756; Ion, 374-77, s. haruspicine; Iph. Taur. 15-16; Phoen. 954-5; 1255-8; Suppl. 155; 211-12.

ἐνόδιοι σύμβολοι, Aeschyl. Prom. 489.

envy (Eurip.), Rhes. 455-8.

ἐπακτός, Sophokl. Trach. 491-2; Eurip. Hippol. 318; s. sickness, witchcraft.

epilepsy, sent by gods, Sophokl. fg. 589 N<sup>2</sup>.

Erinyes = spectre. Aeschyl. Eum. 106-9.

name not to be mentioned, Sophokl. O. C. 129; Eurip. Or. 37-8; s. name, souls.

as beast, Eurip. Iph. Taur. 291-4; Or. 260.

as snake, Aeschyl. Eum. 128; Eurip. Iph. Taur. 285-7; Or. 256.

dog-shaped? Sophokl. El. 1386-8.

brass-footed? Sophokl. El. 488-91.

of black color, Eurip. Or. 322; s. black.

cannibalic, Aeschyl. Eum. 301; Eurip. Or. 256-61 and schol.

sucks blood, Aeschyl. Eum. 181-2; 260-3; 297-8 and schol.; Sophokl. Ai. 843-4; Eurip. Androm. 978; Iph. Taur. 934-5; Or. 256.

midnight their time, Aeschyl. Eum. 109.

evil eye, Aeschyl. Agam. 910-11; Eum. 361-2; Prom. 360; 900-1; Suppl. 970-2; Eurip. fg. 209 N<sup>2</sup>; fg. 294 N<sup>2</sup>; fg. 403 N<sup>2</sup>; fg. 933 N<sup>2</sup>? Hippothoon, fg. 2 N<sup>2</sup>; fg. ad. 167 N<sup>2</sup>; fg. ad. 533 N<sup>2</sup>.

evil eye works "possession," Sophokl. fg. 173 N<sup>2</sup>; s. διμονίζεσθαι. falls on prominence or riches, Sophokl. Ai. 157; fg. ad. 547 N<sup>2</sup>.

protection against, Sophokl. O. T. 159-64.

curse against, Agathon, fg. 23 N<sup>2</sup>. falls back on the possessor, Karinos, fg. 8 N<sup>2</sup>; s. βάσκανος.

## F.

Face, turned away in herb gathering, Sophokl. fg. 491 N<sup>2</sup>.

fascination, Aeschyl. Agam. 447-50 ("becried"); Sophokl. fg. 433 N<sup>2</sup>; s. Ἰνυξ.

by gifts, Sophokl. Ai. 661-5; cp. 817-8; s. p. 19.

fire, purifying, Eurip. Or. 40 and schol.

gods appear in it, Eurip. Bacch. 1082-5; fg. ad. 33 N<sup>2</sup>.

breaks charm? Sophokl. Trach. 607 and schol.

invoked in charming? Sophokl. fg. 492 N<sup>2</sup>.

charm against? Eurip. Androm. 271-3.

## G.

Gods, appear in fire, Eurip. Bacch. 1082-5; fg. ad. 33 N<sup>2</sup>; s. fire.

secret names of, Eurip. fg. 781 N<sup>2</sup>.

gold, and spectres, Eurip. Hecub. 110.

and death, in ritual, Eurip. Hecub. 152 and schol. (doubtful).

Gorgo, as headless spectre, Eurip. Alc. 1118.

as amulet (Eurip.) Rhes. 306; s. amulet.

## H.

Hades, huntsman, Aeschyl. Agam. 1069 (doubtful).

Hades, cannibalic, Sophokl. El. 542-3.

fetches his victims, Eurip. Alc. 259-61; Sosiphanes, fg. 3 N<sup>2</sup>; fg. ad. 127 N<sup>2</sup>.

sends spectres, Eurip. Phoen. 810-11.

= Thanatos, Eurip. Alc. 225.

mother of, Aeschyl. Agam. 1189.

hands, both used in purification, Sophokl. O. C. 483.

haruspication, Sophokl. fg. 910 N<sup>2</sup>? Eurip. El. 827-9; Ion, 374-7; Suppl. 212-3; s. *ἐμπυρομαντεία*; s. p. 22.

hearth, cult of, Aeschyl. Agam. 1009-10; Sophokl. Philoct. 533-5 and schol.

and dining-table, Aeschyl. Atham. fg. 1 N<sup>2</sup>.

seat of the house-elf, Eurip. Hel. 819-20; s. elves.

Hekate, image of, in front of house, Aeschyl. fg. 388 N<sup>2</sup>.

swarm of, Eurip. Hel. 570; fg. ad. 375 N<sup>2</sup>.

sends spectres, Eurip. Hel. 569.

goddess of witches, Eurip. Med. 394-6.

invoked in charm-song? Sophokl. fg. 492 N<sup>8</sup>.

Helen, as St. Elmo's fire, Eurip. Or. 1637; s. St. Elmo's fire.

herbs, rites in gathering of, Sophokl. fg. 491 N<sup>2</sup>; s. charm-song, copper, covering, face, nudity, *ῥιζοτόμοι*.

Hippalectryon, apotropaeic, Aeschyl. fg. 134 N<sup>2</sup>.

honey, in purification, Sophokl. O. C. 481.

-cakes appease the dead, Eurip. Iph. Taur. 165-6.

horses, protected by amulets (Eurip.) Rhes. 306; 308; s. amulet, bells, Gorgo.

horses, shorn in sign of mourning, Eurip. Alc. 428-9; s. p. 23.

#### I.

*Ἰατρομαντῆς*, Aeschyl. Agam. 1593-4; Eum. 62? Suppl. 250-6? fg. 460 N<sup>2</sup>.

ivy, chthonic plant, Iophon, fg. 3 N<sup>2</sup>.

used for drinking-cups? Eurip. Alc. 756; s. p. 24.

*ἰνυγέ*, of the love-exciting force of the eye, Sophokl. fg. 433 N<sup>2</sup>; s. evil eye.

#### K.

*Κῆρες*, cannibalic, Aristias of Phlius, fg. 3 N<sup>2</sup>.

as dogs, Eurip. El. 1252-3; 1342-3.

*κληδών*, Aeschyl. Prom. 489; Sophokl. El. 1108-10.

*κληρομαντεία*, Eurip. Phoen. 838.

#### L.

Lamia, Eurip. fg. 922 N<sup>2</sup>.

laurel, incites to enthusiasm, Sophokl. fg. 811 N<sup>2</sup>.

laws against witchcraft, Eurip. Androm. 355-60.

left, unlucky, Sophokl. Ai. 183.

lightning, and paradise, Aeschyl. *Ἀργεῖοι*, fg. 17 N<sup>2</sup>.

locked up, Aeschyl. Eum. 812-14.

and burial, Eurip. Suppl. 934-8;

Phaethon, fg. 786 N<sup>2</sup>; s. burial.

love-charm, Sophokl. Trach. 575; s. blood; Trach. 1138-9.

#### M.

Magic, Eurip. Or. 1497-8; F. T. G.<sup>2</sup> p. 550-1; s. Thessaly; fg. ad. 592 N<sup>2</sup>.

magician, contemptible position of, Sophokl. O. T. 387-9.

magician, as necromancer, Python, fg. 1 N<sup>2</sup>.

causes eclipse of the moon, Sossiphanes, fg. 1 N<sup>2</sup>.

mania, sent by gods or demons, Sophokl. Ai. 172-82; 278-9; 450-2; 457-9; 611; fg. 227 N<sup>2</sup>; Eurip. Hippol. 141-4; Achaïos, fg. 30 N<sup>2</sup>.

mantic, Aeschyl. Prom. 486.

μασχαλισμός, Aeschyl. Choeph. 427-30; fg. 354 N<sup>2</sup>; Sophokl. El. 444-5 and schol.; cp. O. T. 1371-3; fg. 485 N<sup>2</sup>; 566 N<sup>2</sup>.

medicine, connected with witchcraft, Sophokl. Trach. 1001-3.

midnight, time of the Erinyes, Aeschyl. Eum. 109.

Μοῖραι = the *Mirae* of modern Greece? Eurip. fg. 285 N<sup>2</sup>.

moon, eclipse of, by magic, Sossiphanes, fg. 1 N<sup>2</sup>.

mourning, rites of, Eurip. Alc. 428-9; s. horses; Ion, fg. 54 N<sup>2</sup>; s. pit, widow.

μύραινα, Aeschyl. Choeph. 991-2; s. *ἐχιδνα*.

myrtle, chthonic herb, Iophon, fg. 3 N<sup>2</sup>.

on tombs, Eurip. El. 512.

## N.

Name, force of, Sophokl. O. C. 129; Eurip. Or. 37-38; Karkinos, fg. 5 N<sup>2</sup>; s. Erinyes, Persephone, soul.

of gods, secret, Eurip. fg. 781 N<sup>2</sup>. ominous, Sophokl. Ai. 430-3.

necromancy, Aeschyl. Persae, 621 ff.; *Ψυχαγωγός*, N<sup>2</sup>, p. 87; Sophokl. Polyidos, fg. 366 and 367 N<sup>2</sup> (doubtful); Eurip. Alc. 1128; fg. 912 N<sup>2</sup>; Python, fg. 1 N<sup>2</sup>.

necromancy, by charm-song, Sophokl. El. 137-9.

and prayer, Aeschyl. Choeph. 466 ff.; s. p. 6 ff.

nightingale, oracle-bird, Sophokl. El. 148-9.

Nile, water of, preserves from sickness, Aeschyl. Suppl. 543.

nine, in purification, Sophokl. O. C. 483; s. number, three.

nudity, in herb-gathering, Sophokl. fg. 491 N<sup>2</sup>; s. *ῥιζοτόμοι*, herb.

number, Aeschyl. Prom. 1014; Sophokl. O. C. 479; 483; Eurip. Hippol. 1213-4; Troad. 82-3; fg. ad. 266 N<sup>2</sup>; s. nine, three.

## O.

Οἰωνιστική, Aeschyl. Prom. 490-4; Sophokl. Antig. 999-1004; 1021; O. C. 97-8; 1313-4; O. T. 52-3; 310; cp. 395-7; 964-6; Eurip. Bacch. 255-7; Herc. fur. 596-7; Hel. 746-7; Hippol. 872-3?; 1055-9; Ion, 179-81; 375-7; Phoen. 766-7; 838-40; Suppl. 213.

οἰωνοθέτης, Sophokl. O. T. 483.

olive-branch in purification, Sophokl. O. C. 484.

omen, Aeschyl. 1623-4; Sophokl. El. 666-8; Eurip. Or. 787-8; Phoen. 858; fg. ad. 466 N<sup>2</sup>.

in a name, Sophokl. Aias 430-3.

in sneezing, Sophokl. fg. 152 N<sup>2</sup>.

in stumbling, Eurip. Heraclid. 730.

omission, Aeschyl. Eum. 272-4; s. purification, silence; Sophokl. O. C. 130-3; cp. 489; O. C. 481; s. wine.

ὄνειρομαντεία, Sophokl. El. 498-500; s. dreams.

ordeal, by fire, Sophokl. Antig. 264 and schol.

by red-hot iron, Sophokl. Antig. 264 and schol.

Orpheus, as wizard, Eurip. Alc. 966-9; Cycl. 646.

### P.

Persephone, mistress of spectres, Eurip. Ion, 1048-50; s. *Εἰνοδία*. name of, not to be mentioned, Karkinos, fg. 5 N<sup>2</sup>; s. name.

*φαρμακεύς* = wizard, Sophokl. Trach. 1140.

*φάρμακον*, fg. ad. 317 N<sup>2</sup>.

philtre, Aeschyl. Agam. 1361-3; Choeph. 1026 (doubtful); Eurip. Androm. 207-8; fg. 103 N<sup>2</sup>; 323 N<sup>2</sup> (both figuratively).

Pollux, as St. Elmo's fire, Eurip. Or. 1637.

presentiments, Aeschyl. Agam. 955-6; Eurip. El. 747-9 (doubtful). Prometheus, inventor of mantic etc. Aeschyl. Prom. 486 ff.

*ψυχαγωγοί*, s. necromancy.

Psylli, fg. ad. 277 N<sup>2</sup>.

purification, Aeschyl. Choeph. 959-62; Eum. 272-4; s. omission, silence; Sophokl. O. T. 99.

rites of, O. C. 466-90; s. earth, face, hands, honey, nine, olive, sunrise, three, wine, wool.

and flowing water, Sophokl. O. T. 1227-8.

as daily practice (exaggerated?) Eurip. fg. 773 N<sup>2</sup>.

after sexual intercourse, Eurip. schol. Hecub. 53.

### R.

Rain-charm, schol. Eurip. Phoen. 347.

red, relation to the nether-world, Eurip. Or. 1431-6.

revenants, Sophokl. Philoct. 624-5, and schol.

right side, lucky, Sophokl. Ai. 183-4.

*ρίζορόμοι*, use magical rites, Sophokl. fg. 491 N<sup>2</sup>; s. herbs.

road to Hades, Eurip. fg. 122 N<sup>2</sup>.

### S.

Scents, characterize the appearance of gods, Eurip. Hippol. 1391.

sea, holiness of, Eurip. Hel. 1271.

purifying, Sophokl. Ai. 654-6; Eurip. Iph. Taur. 1039-41; 1139.

evil sprites, and evil in general, thrown into it, Aeschyl. Suppl. 512-3; Sophokl. O. T. 190-7; 1411-12.

sea-water, Aeschyl. Persae, 575; Eurip. Hecub. 609-13; cp. 47; Iph. Taur. 255.

shields, signs of, Aeschyl. Septem. 370-3; 380-2, and schol. 417-7; 449-52; 475-8; 495-504; 522-6; 627-31; fg. 422 N<sup>2</sup>; Eurip. El. 458-75 (spec. 468-9); Phoen. 1108-36, passim; fg. 530 N<sup>2</sup>.

sickness, as demon, Sophokl. O. T. 27-8.

effected by witchery, Sophokl. Trach. 491-2; Eurip. Hippol. 318; s. *ἐπακρός*, witchcraft.

sent by gods, Eurip. fg. 292 N<sup>2</sup>.

silence, Aeschyl. Eum. 272-4; s. omission, purification.

Siren = Hades-demon? Sophokl. fg. 777 N<sup>2</sup>.

snake, and eye, Aeschyl. Persae, 81-2.

- snake, and eagle, Sophokl. Antig.  
113-126 and schol; s. eagle,  
sympathy.  
as amulet, Eurip. Ion, 24-6;  
1427-31; s. amulet.  
charm against, Eurip. Androm.  
269-73 (doubtful).  
sneezing, ominous, Sophokl. fg.  
152 N<sup>2</sup>; s. omen, *σύμβολοι*.  
soothsayer, begging, Aeschyl.  
Agam. 1149; 1227-8.  
souls, as dogs, Eurip. fg. 469 N<sup>2</sup>  
(doubtful).  
and Erinys. Eurip. Or. 37-8; s.  
Erinys; name.  
return to the upper world (or  
ascend to the ether), Sophokl.  
fg. 795 N<sup>2</sup>.  
spectres, dead as, Eurip. Alc.  
1127; Phoen. 1543-5; fg. ad.  
370 N<sup>2</sup>.  
sent by Hades, Eurip. Phoen.  
810-11.  
by Hekate, Eurip. Hel. 569.  
are the swarm of Hekate, Eurip.  
Hel. 570; fg. ad. 375 N<sup>2</sup>.  
ruled by Persephone, Eurip. Ion  
1048-50.  
unburied men become s., Eurip.  
Hecub. 1-54; s. burial.  
are harmful, fg. ad. 370 N<sup>2</sup>.  
are invisible? Sophokl. Ai. 301-2.  
appear at day or night, Eurip.  
Ion 1049-50.  
salutation of, Eurip. Hel. 569;  
Herc. fur. 820-1.  
fly through the air, Eurip. Phoen.  
1543-5.  
and gold, Eurip. Hecub. 110.  
spell, Aeschyl. Eum. 81-2 (doubt-  
ful); 272-4; s. purification,  
Sophokl. O. T. 72.  
spitting (*ἀποπτύειν*), Aeschyl. Agam.  
943-4; 1146-7; Eum. 68; 189;  
299; Prom. 1068-9; fg. 354 N<sup>2</sup>;  
Sophokl. fg. 617 N<sup>2</sup>; Eurip.  
Hecub. 1275-6; Iph. Aul.  
508-10; 873-4; fg. 533 N<sup>2</sup>.  
*σπλαγχομαντεία*, Aeschyl. Prom.  
495-500; s. also *ἐμπυρομαν-  
τεία*, haruspication.  
*σποδομαντεία*, Sophokl. O. T. 21.  
stars = Herakles and Hebe, Eurip.  
Heraclid. 854-7.  
sign of apotheosis, Eurip. Hera-  
clid. 571-2.  
shooting = souls, Eurip. fg. 971 N<sup>2</sup>.  
steel-proof, Eurip. Hel. 810.  
sterility, cured by charms, Eurip.  
Med. 717-8.  
*στερνόμαντις* = ventriloquist. Soph-  
okl. fg. 56 N<sup>2</sup>.  
stumbling, ominous, Eurip. Hera-  
clid. 730; s. omen.  
sun, breaks charm, Sophokl. Trach.  
606; 685; 695-7 (doubtful).  
invoked in charm-song? Sophokl.  
fg. 492 N<sup>2</sup>; (*ῥιζοτόμοι*).  
-rise and purification, Sophokl.  
O. C. 477.  
as bird, Aeschyl. Suppl. 202-3;  
s. p. 18.  
*σύμβολοι*, s. sneezing.  
sympathy, Aeschyl. Prom. 493-4.  
and antipathy, Sophokl. Antig.  
113-126 and schol. (eagle,  
snake); fg. ad. 396 N<sup>2</sup> (*ἄγνος*  
and vine).
- T.
- Table, holiness of, Aeschyl. Agam.  
386-7; 676 ff.; s. hearth.  
tears, of gods, Aeschyl. Eum. 773 ff.;  
789-91.  
*τερασκόπος*, Aeschyl. Eum. 62;  
Sophokl. O. T. 605.  
Thessaly, seat of witches and magi-  
cians. Eurip. F. T. G.<sup>2</sup> p.  
550-1 (Mos. Chor.); Sosi-  
phanes, fg. 1, N<sup>2</sup>.

Thrace, seat of witches, Eurip. Alc. 966-9.

three, Aeschyl. Prom. 1014; Sophokl. O. C. 479; s. purification; O. C. 483; s. nine; Eurip. Hippol. 1213-14; Troad. 82-3; fg. ad. 266 N<sup>2</sup>; s. number.

trifolium, magical herb, Sophokl. fg. 746 N<sup>2</sup>.

turning round, forbidden in purification, Sophokl. O. C. 490; s. face.

### U.

"Unbekried," Aeschyl. Agam. 614-5; 867-8; Septem. 5; 9; Sophokl. Ai. 187; 657-9; Trach. 604-9? fg. 458 N<sup>2</sup>; (Eurip.) Rhes. 342-5; 467-8; s. Ἄδ-  
ράστεια.

### V.

Vine, chthonic, Iophon, fg. 3 N<sup>2</sup>.  
and ἄγνος, fg. ad. 396 N<sup>2</sup>; s. sympathy.

### W.

Water, flowing, in purification, Sophokl. O. C. 470; 1227-8; Eurip. El. 793-4; Hippol. 648-9; s. purification.

waves, third the highest; s. three.

wax, in magic, Sophokl. fg. 493 N<sup>2</sup>.

whistling, Aeschyl. Prom. 358-9.

widow, burial, traces of, Ion fg. 54 N<sup>2</sup>; s. mourning rites; s. p. 26.

wine, not used in purification, Sophokl. O. C. 481; s. omission, purification.

witchcraft, accounts for sickness, Sophokl. Trach. 491-2; Eurip. Hippol. 317-8; s. ἐπακτός, sickness.

and medicine, Sophokl. Trach. 1001-3; s. medicine.

punishable by law, Eurip. Androm. 355-60; s. laws.

witches, Eurip. Alc. 966-9; Androm. 159-60; Sosiphanes, fg. 1 N<sup>2</sup>.

Thessaly their seat, Eurip. F.T.G.<sup>2</sup> p. 550-1; Sosiphanes, fg. 1 N<sup>2</sup>; s. Thessaly.

Thrace their seat, Eurip. Alc. 966-9; s. Thrace.

Asia their seat, Eurip. Androm. 159-60; s. Asia.

and moon, Sosiphanes, fg. 1, N.<sup>2</sup>; s. eclipse, moon.

wizards, Aeschyl. Choeph. 810; Sophokl. Trach. 1140; Eurip. Bacch. 233-4; Hippol. 1038-40. Corinthians, a people of, schol. Eurip. Med. 11; s. Cor.

Orpheus, as w., Eurip. Alc. 966-9; Cycl. 646; s. Orph.

women, s. witches.

wool, bands of, in purification, Sophokl. O. C. 475; s. purification.

word, force of, Eurip. Herc. 1218-9; Or. 75; fg. 427 N<sup>2</sup>.

ominous, Aeschyl. fg. 36 N<sup>2</sup>; s. spell, charm-song.